

smoking and then quickly randomise them to either act on that decision as soon as possible or to select a later quit date and spend the intervening time planning. Nevertheless, an RCT of abrupt, unplanned versus delayed, planned quitting is greatly needed for several reasons. For example, the most common psychological treatments for smoking typically have smokers spend a few weeks preparing for quitting before their quit date.² If delaying is detrimental, this practice needs to be changed. As another example, reduction for several weeks before quitting has recently been approved as a treatment in several countries (www.ash.org.uk/html/cessation/smoking%20reduction/NRT051229.pdf). If delaying is advantageous, then perhaps much of the efficacy of reduction is due, not to reduction per se, but rather due to simply putting off the quit date till later.

In summary, we believe the findings of these two recent studies that many smokers quit spontaneously and that impulsive quitting is associated with increased success are important. We believe these data suggest clinicians should not recommend all smokers delay quitting to make plans for quitting. However, we also believe these data are insufficient to indicate that the best course for all smokers is to quit immediately. Until we have data from some RCTs, perhaps a reasonable middle ground is to discuss the pros and cons of quitting now versus later and let each smoker decide what is best.

John R Hughes

University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, USA

Matthew J Carpenter

Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, USA

Correspondence to: John R Hughes, MD, University of Vermont, Departments of Psychiatry, Psychology & Family Practice, Ira Allen School, 38 Fletcher Place, Burlington, VT 05401-1419, USA; john.hughes@uvm.edu

doi: 10.1136/tc.2006.017863

REFERENCES

- 1 **Larabie LC.** To what extent do smokers plan quit attempts? *Tob Control* 2005;**14**:425-8.
- 2 **Abrams DB, Niaura R, Brown RA, et al.** *The tobacco dependence treatment handbook. A guide to best practices.* New York: The Guilford Press, 2003.
- 3 **West R, Sohal T.** Catastrophic pathways to smoking cessation: findings from a national survey. *BMJ* 2006;**302**:458-60.
- 4 **Flaxman J.** Quitting smoking now or later: gradual, abrupt, immediate and delayed quitting. *Behav Ther* 1978;**9**:260-70.

Clinical Evidence—Call for contributors

Clinical Evidence is a regularly updated evidence-based journal available worldwide both as a paper version and on the internet. *Clinical Evidence* needs to recruit a number of new contributors. Contributors are healthcare professionals or epidemiologists with experience in evidence-based medicine and the ability to write in a concise and structured way.

Areas for which we are currently seeking contributors:

- Pregnancy and childbirth
- Endocrine disorders
- Palliative care
- Tropical diseases

We are also looking for contributors for existing topics. For full details on what these topics are please visit www.clinicalevidence.com/ceweb/contribute/index.jsp. However, we are always looking for others, so do not let this list discourage you.

Being a contributor involves:

- Selecting from a validated, screened search (performed by in-house Information Specialists) epidemiologically sound studies for inclusion.
- Documenting your decisions about which studies to include on an inclusion and exclusion form, which we keep on file.
- Writing the text to a highly structured template (about 1500-3000 words), using evidence from the final studies chosen, within 8-10 weeks of receiving the literature search.
- Working with *Clinical Evidence* editors to ensure that the final text meets epidemiological and style standards.
- Updating the text every 12 months using any new, sound evidence that becomes available. The *Clinical Evidence* in-house team will conduct the searches for contributors; your task is simply to filter out high quality studies and incorporate them in the existing text.

If you would like to become a contributor for *Clinical Evidence* or require more information about what this involves please send your contact details and a copy of your CV, clearly stating the clinical area you are interested in, to CECommissioning@bmjgroup.com.

Call for peer reviewers

Clinical Evidence also needs to recruit a number of new peer reviewers specifically with an interest in the clinical areas stated above, and also others related to general practice. Peer reviewers are healthcare professionals or epidemiologists with experience in evidence-based medicine. As a peer reviewer you would be asked for your views on the clinical relevance, validity, and accessibility of specific topics within the journal, and their usefulness to the intended audience (international generalists and healthcare professionals, possibly with limited statistical knowledge). Topics are usually 1500-3000 words in length and we would ask you to review between 2-5 topics per year. The peer review process takes place throughout the year, and out turnaround time for each review is ideally 10-14 days.

If you are interested in becoming a peer reviewer for *Clinical Evidence*, please complete the peer review questionnaire at www.clinicalevidence.com/ceweb/contribute/peerreviewer.jsp